A Tsunami Forecast Model for Kihei, Hawai'i
Comment Review Response Form

General Comments	Action Accepted/Rejected	Brief Responder Comments
The report describes a tsunami forecast model and its verification with a more detailed, reference model. The approach is systematic and the work was carefully executed. I am in general agreement with the results and findings. However, there are needs for improvement in the text and the organization of the report prior to its publication.	Accepted	The report was edited by NOAA/PMEL in-house editor to address improvements in the text and organization.
I could see at least three writing styles in the report. The author should avoid using published materials verbatim even though the sources are properly cited. I find many grammatical, stylistic, and typographical errors in Sections 4 and 5. Some of the sentences are not logically connected to deliver a coherent message. I also see repetitive statements and descriptions. It is ok to reiterate an important point, but don't repeat the same sentences.	Accepted	The report was edited by NOAA/PMEL in-house editor to address improvements in the text and organization.
Only one Mw ~0 is needed for testing	Accepted	

Additional comment lines can be inserted by hitting the 'tab' key at the end of a row

Specific Comments *(Field will expand upon reaching the end of each line)*	Action Accepted/Rejected	Brief Responder Comments
Abstract, remove the term "optimized version"	Accepted	Removed
Section 1.0. Shorten the second and third paragraphs. The information is irrelevant to the tsunami forecast model. Delete the sentence "Higher education is available from Kapiolani Community College, Leeward Community College, ..." in the third paragraph. Those colleges are on Oahu, not Maui	Accepted	This has been addressed as suggested.
Page 4, line 2. Delete "earthquake". I don't think the model code can stimulate earthquakes.	Accepted	The phrase was changed to 'tsunami source generation due to earthquake'.
Section 3.3, first paragraph. Was LiDAR topography used in the study?	Accepted	Information added in Section 3.0
Section 4.3, last paragraph. Change "coastal shelf' to "coastal reef".	Accepted	Text has been changed to 'coastal reef'.
Table 3. Some description is needed in the text for the reader to understand the information under "Model Tsunami Source".	Accepted	Text added in Section 3.2 to describe 'Model Tsunami Source' in Table 3.
Figures 10 and 11, reference model, flow speed. There appears to be instability near the lower left corner of the grid. It would be	Accepted	What looks like instability in Figure 10

addressed in the text.		and 11 is explained in Section 4.3, paragraph 3.
Figures 12, 19, 48, 54, and others. Explain why the forecast model results are so far off from the reference. I would be quite concerned with the forecast model if it underestimates the wave by more than one third.	Accepted	Explanations on why the forecast the maximum tsunami amplitude of the forecast model is much lower than the reference is discussed in Section 4.3.
Figures 6 to 59 have the same format. The lack of description in the text makes it difficult to identify the subtle differences. The author pointed out some features in the figures but offered no explanations. I suggest the author include a matrix to identify all test cases and only include a few relevant sets of results for in-depth discussion. The sheer number of similar figures can lose the readers very easily.	Accepted	The number of figures was reduced to show only representative inundation with a table listing the type of inundation.

Additional comment lines can be inserted by hitting the 'tab' key at the end of a row